R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 898 AC 001 891

CRITERIA THAT SHOULD INFORM A DOCTRINE OF MID-CAREER EDUCATION. PREPARED FOR A CONFERENCE ON UNIVERSITY EDUCATION FOR MID-CAREER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. (FEB 11-12, 1966).

BY- EGGER, ROWLAND A.
PRINCETON UNIV., N.J.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- #CRITERIA, #PROFESSIONAL CONTINUING EDUCATION,#GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, #PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION, #POLICY FORMATION, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION, UNIVERSITIES, EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT,

MIDCAREER MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION FOR FEDERAL CIVIL SERVANTS REQUIRED AN ACCEPTED SET OF RULES AND STANDARDS FOR MAKING JUDGMENTS RELATING TO THE INTELLECTUAL IMPROVEMENT OF CAREER CIVIL SERVANTS WHO QUALIFY FOR HIGHER, MORE RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY MAKING POSITIONS. CRITERIA FOR SUCH A DOCTRINE WOULD PERTAIN TO CHANGES ACHIEVED IN INDIVIDUALS, PURPOSES TO BE SERVED BY THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, AND THE ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL SUITABILITY OF A GIVEN EDUCATIONAL SETTING. A WIDER PERSPECTIVE ON ONE'S OWN PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY, INCREASED ABILITY TO ANALYZE PROBLEMS, A COMMAND OF THE GENERALITIES OF LOGIC AND OF NONQUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS, AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PURPOSE AND NATURE OF STAFF WORK, AND THE ABILITY TO MINIMIZE RISKS IN PUBLIC POLICY INNOVATIONS ARE RELEVANT OBJECTIVES. HOWEVER, CONSIDERING THE ABILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE AVERAGE MIDCAREER CANDIDATE AND THE LIBERAL ARTS STANDARD THAT DOMINATES UNIVERSITY GRADUATE EDUCATION, THE UNDERLYING ISSUE IS REALLY THIS--WHETHER PREPARATION FOR MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS IS TO BE ORGANIZED AS INTEGRAL, PROFESSIONAL GRADUATE EDUCATION WITH ITS OWN CONTENT AND METHODOLOGY, OR WHETHER THERE CAN BE AN INSTRUCTIONAL APPARATUS WHICH IS PROFESSIONAL FOR SOME STUDENTS, SEMIPROFESSIONAL FOR OTHERS, AND NONPROFESSIONAL FOR STILL OTHER STUDENTS AND FOR MOST OF THE FACULTY. (LY)

ED016898

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

CRITERIA THAT SHOULD INFORM A DOCTRINE OF MID-CAREER EDUCATION

by

ROWLAND A. EGGER

Princeton University

Prepared for

Conference on University Education for Mid-Career Government Officials

February 11-12, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE001 891

CRITERIA THAT SHOULD INFORM A DOCTRINE OF MID-CAREER EDUCATION

OUTLINE

I. Introduction

II. Criteria Related to the People to be Educated

- A. Community of Commitment
- B. Community of Achievement
- C. Readiness for Managerial Responsibilities
- D. Relativity of Standards

III. Criteria Related to the Purpose to be Served

- A. Broadening Horizons
- B. Understanding the Purpose and Nature of Staff Work
- C. Accentuating Rigorousness of Judgment
- D. Developing Administrative Entrepreneurship

IV. Criteria Related to the Capacity of the Instrument

- A. Mid-Career Education and the Liberal Arts Tradition
- B. Mid-Career Education and the Teacher-Scholar Bias
- C. Mid-Career Education and Pre-Career Education

CRITERIA THAT SHOULD INFORM A DOCTRINE OF MID-CAREER EDUCATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND MANAGEMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The specific terms of reference of this paper should be carefully noted. First, it is concerned with criteria; criteria may be defined, in simplest terms, as rules or standards for making judgments. Second, the criteria with which it is concerned relate to a doctrine; a doctrine is a body of accepted belief embodying the fundamental assumptions of an intellectual or theological discipline. As such, it deals primarily with the "why" questions, rather than with "what," "how," or "when." Third, the doctrine to the formulation of which it seeks to contribute is one of mid-career education; mid-career education is concerned with the intellectual improvement of persons with established career commitments. Fourth, the mid-career education to which it is addressed is limited to education in public affairs and management. Fifth, the education in public affairs and management with which it is involved is that of employees of the United States Government.

I. INTRODUCTION

These self-imposed limitations upon the scope of the paper, and perhaps upon the scope of the Conference, are not capricious. They confer a number of important advantages, and offer the possibility of differentiating this Conference in a significant way from previous discussions of mid-career education for public employees. The entire thrust of the Conference is in the direction of developing an agreed statement of doctrine. We may therefore put aside questions of curriculum, organization, method, selection, rating, finance and the myriad other matters of ways and means with which we have tended hitherto to be preoccupied. Moreover, we do not need again to become involved in the familiar issue of the professional status of the civil service. At the general level of discourse, there can be no doubt that the mid-career employees selected for and admitted to the educational programs in public affairs and management in which we are participating are professional civil servants. Finally, by limiting the inquiry to year-long educational operations such as those under way at Harvard, Princeton, Virginia, Indiana, Chicago and Stanford, and in preparation at Cornell and Washington, a homogeneity of concern is achieved which would not be possible if all varieties of mid-career education were taken into consideration. Obviously, mid-career educational programs in nuclear physics, accounting, civil engineering, or medicine -- to take a few examples at random -- are the products of educational doctrines informed by quite different criteria from those which instruct education in public affairs and management. Short-courses in technical, methodological or even general cultural

subjects are likewise responsive to quite different standards of doctrinal evaluation.

The factors supporting the assumption that the mid-career Federal employees admitted to these programs are professional civil servants are, in broad perspective, five-fold. In the first place, they have entered upon their occupations through competitive processes, which have differentiated them from their fellows at least to the extent that they appeared to some examining board at some point in time to have superior qualifications for some position or group of positions in the Federal service. In the second place, they have continued their connection with the Federal Government for a period of time sufficient to establish at least a prima-facie case for the assumption that the public service represents a career choice which, extraordinary circumstances aside, will command their continued adherence throughout their working lives. Third, this commitment on the side of the employee is matched on the side of the Federal government with tenure status, guaranteeing not only a substantial security of employment but advancement in rank and salary in accordance with demonstrated ability insofar as available openings and the government's capacity to evaluate demonstrated ability permit. Fourth, selection for a mid-career educational opportunity indicates, or should indicate, a level of achievement in the Federal civil service going beyond the mere maintenance of tenure rights; within their assignments to the time they were selected for the educational experience, these employees were presumably more than ordinarily successful. Fifth, the mid-career employees sent to the educational programs in public affairs and management are, almost to a man, those who have been selected by their employing agencies for assignment to positions involving larger administrative responsibilities; in the main the mid-career students are returning to, or will shortly oocupy, jobs qualitatively rather different from those in which they have made their records in the civil service, to the effective performance of which the mid-career educational opportunity, superimposed upon their previous experience, is presumed to offer an important increment in their managerial aptitudes and capacities to participate constructively in the policy process.

The elaboration of a doctrine of mid-Career education for professional civil servants on the threshold of expanded responsibilities in policy formulation and management is no easy task. Universities, of course, are constantly involved in the analysis and reconsideration of educational doctrine, and in the reformulation of the criteria by which doctrinal adjustments are judged. The entire orientation of graduate instruction in economics, politics, sociology and even history, to take the academic disciplines most heavily involved in mid-career education, has been drastically altered during the past two decades.

Methodological developments have not only changed the processes but have wrought fundamental alternations in the subject matter of the disciplines themselves, and technological obsolescence in both teachers and teaching materials continues apace. Universities are, on the whole, fairly competent to deal with problems of this nature within the context of a generally well-understood and agreed conception of educational purpose -- a doctrine. But where a doctrine is lacking, as is largely the case in mid-career education for management and public affairs, the assumptions likely to prevail are those of the more familiar teacher-scholar doctrines of the basic disciplines. These doctrines are probably of limited applicability to mid-career education.

The central element in the criteria of a doctrine of mid-career education is, quite clearly, the people to be educated. Whatever the criteria, and however the doctrine may be formulated, the end result will be a certain change, for better or worse, in the people submitted to the experience. Second, we require criteria for the development of doctrine concerning the purpose to be served by the educational experience. Third, we need urgently doctrine concerning the capacity, actual and potential, of the educational instrument which has been chosen to meet the needs of the students and to serve the purposes of the Government.

II. CRITERIA RELATED TO THE PEOPLE TO BE EDUCATED

Civil servants come to mid-career education from backgrounds of education and experience that are widely disparate. Some have received training that is essentially vocational; some have been educated, successfully or unsuccessfully, in the liberal arts; some have participated in professional education; some have received advanced degrees in the teacher-scholar tradition of the liberal arts disciplines. Some have worked for the government as technicians, some as administrators, and a few as program entrepreneurs. Some have worked in Washington, some in district or regional offices, and some in the field at the cutting edge of the public administration. Some have served abroad. Despite these differences there is a substantial community amongst them. This community is of commitment, of achievement, and of readiness for managerial responsibility.

A. The Community of Commitment

The community of commitment of mid-career civil servants is a subtle phenomenon. In its simplest and most general aspect it is a commitment to public service. The commitment at this level is highly unspecific, and the reasons attributed to the choice of public employment are not more sophisticated than -- indeed, they are little different from -- those offered by the general run of civil servants reported in, for example, the Brookings Institution studies of the prestige of Federal employment. In and of itself, the mid-career educational experience is not likely to affect this commitment one way or another, although re-exposure to the academic environment is observed frequently to animate the latent professorial ambitions that most civil servants with successful graduate experience carry in their intellectual knapsacks. The infection is most virulent in the military services, with their lower retirement ages, and appears to vary directly with proximity to the attainment of standard academic credentials. On balance, however, the mid-career educational experience subverts few public servants.

Two other aspects of the community of commitment appear likely to be affected by the mid-career educational experience, and present fundamental doctrinal issues to the managers of the educational enterprise. A civil servant comes to mid-career education not only with a general commitment to the public service, but with a somewhat more specific commitment to an area of administration, and normally with a highly specific commitment to an agency and even to a program. On the whole, mid-career education tends to have an essentially ambivalent influence on these commitments. To the extent that the student encounters universals in the policy and management processes which correspond to his

previous experience, phenomena which he has in the past dealt with on an ad hoc basis are illuminated and brought within the four corners of theory and principle. On the other hand, since the preoccupation of the seminars in both policy and administrative processes is with universals he is quickly led to realize that what he has been accustomed to think of as public welfare administration, or social security management, or old age and survivors insurance operations is in fact a part of the general body of expertise in public policy and management.

Now this is not the hackneyed argument about the roles of generalists and specialists in the public service. Indeed, the fact of mid-career programs, an important part of the purpose of which is to superimpose managerial and policy skills upon a foundation largely of specialized education and almost certainly of specialized government experience, is evidence of the irrelevance of this issue to mid-career education, and perhaps to education for public affairs generally. The problem is rather that of the value assigned to agency and program commitments, entertained alike by technicians, specialists, and general administrators, in furthering the professional opportunities of mid-career civil servants. A doctrine of mid-career education cannot in good faith avoid setting a value on area agency and program commitments, and facing the implications of its judgments about this value.

B. The Community of Achievement

The community of achievement which mid-career employees bring to the educational enterprise is at least as varied and miscellaneous as their formal education and their prior work experience. In general, however, three areas of special competence tend to characterize most of the students. First, they have demonstrated superior technical qualifications usually in some relatively narrow administrative function. Second, they have established their capacity to operate effectively in an organization. Third, they have given evidence of qualities which transcend technical competence and adaptability to the restrictions of work in an organization which creates a presumption of their readiness for expanded responsibilities in the formulation of public policy and the management of the machinery of government.

Since there is no defined administrative class in the Federal service, and no identified cadre of heirs to administrative empires, the students with whom we are concerned have normally worked their way up the career ladder through achievement in relatively specialized and sometimes quite narrow occupations. This is true without much regard to the type of agency in which they have been employed. An examiner or an organization and

methods man in the Bureau of the Budget is just as much a specialist, applying a body of expertise just as esoteric as -- and sometimes no less dogmatic than -- that applied by a plant pathologist in the Department of Agriculture. Input-output measurements and cost-benefit ratios are roughly of about the same order of specificity and, even if somewhat less predictability than the behavior of colloids and enzymes. It is only at a medium-high position in the heirarchy that either become discernibly related to issues of public policy and management. The capacity to perceive these relationships is, or ought to be, an important criterion in the selection of empbyees for the mid-career educational experience. And the sharpening of this perceptiveness is surely a major criterion of the educational process.

Obviously, if the appointees had not been able to adapt themselves to the life of the organization, they would not be in mid-career, and we would never see them at the universities. But there is adaption and adaption. On the whole, the students who are admitted to the mid-career program appear not only to have accepted the limitations of work in an organizational context, but to have recognized and embraced the opportunities which planned, programmed and concerted activity alone provide. They have in one way or another transcended the negative limitations of "institutionalization" and a few appear to have discovered the possibility of innovation and even of invention in the administrative process. This is an important datum in the formulation of a doctrine of mid-career education.

If reasonable credence is to be given to the comments of supervisors and other superiors written in support of applications, students admitted to the mid-career programs have, during their work experience, exhibited some indications of aptitude for management. Typically, although by no means universally, the students have had supervisory responsibility, in the sense that they have been responsible for the work of varying numbers of subordinates, and have been charged with planning, assigning, overseeing and coordinating the efforts of these subordinates in the achievement of a stated goal. They have sometimes had a part in formulating the goal, and frequently in planning the allocation of resources for the achievement of organizational objectives, The dossiers, on the whole, tend to support the conclusion that in meeting these responsibilities the employees recommended for the mid-career programs have gone somewhat beyond the requirements of foremanship specified in the standard operating procedures, and have brought to their assignments qualities of thought and habits of work suggestive of managerial qualifications. A doctrine of mid-career education should be able to assign a value to these basic achievements in the managerial art, and to assay their significances for the mid-career educational experiences.

C. Readiness for Managerial Responsibilities

It is difficult to conceive of a situation more fraught with peril both for the public service and the mid-career educational enterprise than one in which a bureau or division chief is face to face with a career-education award recipient and open between them is the graduate announcement of the university to which the awardee has been assigned. Nor do the letters of intent frequently filed by applicants, some of whom eventually become awardees, indicate very much greater understanding of the art of the possible. Read critically, however, there is much to be gained by way of insight and understanding of the felt needs of the applicants and their supervisors through the perusal of these non-supporting documents. It usually comes out, of course, to something like 42 semester hours of hydrology, 12 of systems analysis, 12 of inter-personal relations, 12 of philosophy, 12 of cost accounting, and 6 of computer programming. This adds up to a 48 hour week, but the employee ought, after all, to make some sacrifice for the privilege of spending a year in the lush environment of a university.

Apart from job-related technical subjects, which seems to be a genuflection in the direction of the Training Act, and reading beyond what is asked for to what is wanted, the felt needs seem to reach toward the expansion of capacities of integrative thinking, intellectual leadership, moral leadership, and human relations. It should be noted that we are talking here not about the broad issue of criteria related to the purpose to be served by the mid-career training program, but the much narrower problem of advancing the students' readiness for managerial responsibilities, When these somewhat inchoate felt needs are transmuted, to the degree they are capable of being transmuted, into purpose, they assume quite different aspects.

Emphasis upon the expansion of capacities for integrative thinking comes mainly from the supervisors, and one cannot escape the impression that there is an autobiographical element in this recurrent note. But it is not less relevant or less valid for that fact. What is being said essentially is that there is little preparation in most of the agencies for keeping up with McNamara and the whiz-kids, or meeting the pressures exerted by the Bureau of the Budget for new kinds of justifications, or responding to the burgeoning psychoanalytical requirements of administration in a democratically addled society. Automation and the computers have brought home with compelling force Drucker's point that only as technicians broaden their competence are they able to plan and operate complex systems.

Over and above skill in what Paul Appleby called the calculus of the administrative process -- ability "to make a mesh out of things" -- is the stark felt need for managers

capable of commanding the intellectual respect of the staff, and of exercising leadership on the basis of the authority of ideas. What is being sought here is something very much like the gist of a lecture Ordway Tead once delivered, which he called "Administration Among the Great Ideas." In it he said:

> Executive actions and their consequences are themselves the best school of instruction. But reflections upon these actions, the formulation of useful generalizations, the evaluation of methods, the comparison of different procedures for producing the same results, the relation of administration to the climate of a society -- all these are a necessary part of the training exposure. And the formulations offered in lectures on all such themes are both an informational and evaluative exercise which should enrich the wisdom of performance if the learning process is having its truly assimilative result. It is in the long run as important to know <u>why</u> we do what we do as to know what to do and how it is done. And the why is the result of a deliberative process which training cannot ignore as part of its responsibility.

A recurrent demand, phrased in many different ways, is preparation for moral leadership. It is difficult to see what the mid-career educational experience is able to contribute to the sensitizing of students to moral and ethical responsibilities. But the importance attached to this facet of preparation for managerial responsibility by their supervisors and superiors is unmistakable. As Chester Barnard has written:

> It must occur to anyone who considers this subject that we are in a state of considerable ignorance. It simply is not known to any wide degree what are number and the character of the moral problems that are faced by those who do the world's work. It is here, I think, that the universities in the future will have a great opportunity, for I doubt if those within our organization can be sufficiently adept and objective to give appropriate study to the nature of the moral problems which they face.

The law schools, of course, have developed a body of doctrine identified generally as "legal ethics." The medical schools have evolved a curiously private-minded set of dogmas relating chiefly to doctor-patient relationships and to relationships among physicians, which goes under the name of "medical ethics." And the literature of public administration is not without penetrating analyses of the ethical aspects of management. It all tends to boil down to something closely akin to the aphorism attributed to the late Claude Swanson: "When in doubt, do right."

But a doctrine of mid-career education cannot ignore the definition of its responsibility in the premises.

We are on somewhat firmer ground in dealing with the emphasis which the supervisors place upon human leadership. Much of the literature of management and administration has dealt with this problem, and many paragraphs epitomizing the phenomenon have been written. Again, Tead has given us one of the best:

> . . .We are talking about intellectual capacity which is in some considerable measure innate and unlearned, about high-level purposiveness, about a contagious enthusiasm for goals and methods needed to achieve them, about a total glamor of personal drive that catches others up into group loyalty, persistent striving, and gratification simultaneously obtained for personal desires and for those satisfactions realized through one's creative institutional contributions.

While we undoubtedly understand better the content of human leadership than of moral leadership, it is doubtful if we are any clearer about what, if anything, the mid-career educational experience is able to contribute to its development. A doctrine of mid-career education must, nevertheless, confront its obligation to cope with this issue.

D. Relativity of Standards

It would be misleading not to point out that the superiority of the large majority of mid-career employees seconded to the universities is relative. They tend to be superior to most of their similarly circumstanced fellow civil servants. In the main, they are not the civil servants most likely to arrive eventually at appointment as division or bureau chiefs, much less assistant or undersecretaries. They are, in the main, a cut above the run of their contemporaries in the civil service, but none the less limited in perspective, modest in ambitions, restrained in imagination, and generally content with the recognition their performance has received. One has the impression that there may, at best, be one more promotion, in addition to what they may receive upon or shortly after returning to their jobs, in them. There are just enough exceptions -- perhaps one in every fifteen or twenty -- to drive home the general conclusion that the universities are not getting the career employees who will form and shape the future of policy and management in the National government.

There are many reasons why this should be so. The present mid-career group entered upon government work a decade or more

ago when Federal employment was not competitive and when the political leadership of the nation reflected little glamour on a commitment to the public service. Many of the best from the colleges and universities went elsewhere. Moreover, the Great Society is nothing if not open, and most of the people of superior intelligence and large physical and nervous energy in the mid-career category are too busily on the make to take a year off for organized reflection.

The fact that the universities are, in the main, getting the better of the second-rate minds in the public service does not denigrate the worthiness of the mid-career educational undertaking, but it does present problems that a doctrine of mid-career education must confront. It puts a ceiling on standards, if the measure of the educational experience is defined in terms of the abilities and needs of those to whom it is offered. And for those institutions in which the mid-career and pre-service education is offered it creates difficult problems of integration. Few of the mid-career fellows exert an inspiring influence on the bright youngsters recently out of the undergraduate colleges, most of whom have received fairly rigorous training in the social and behavioral sciences, and whose native intellectual abilities are usually considerably greater than the average of the mid-career group. The problems of a creative integration of the groups is not impossible, but it does call into question the easy assumptions made at the initiation of the mid-career programs, that contact between the mid-career types and the intellectuals -- even the activist intellectuals -- would invariably yield sweetness and light. Like taking a hard look at one's prospective mother-in-law, it gives the young gentlemen furiously to think.

It would be comforting to suppose that this is a transient phenomenon, which a wider understanding of mid-career education will in time overcome. On the other hand, in a <u>plunderbund</u> economic and social order, it is likely that there will be more and longer periods in which public service employment will be non-competitive than in which it will be competitive or superior in attractiveness. And one does not have to be an economic determinist to contemplate that decisions will be made, in the future as in the past, in recognition of this fact.

III. CRITERIA RELATED TO THE PURPOSES TO BE SERVED

The purposes to be served by mid-career education, as distinguished from the expectations of executives, supervisors and nominees for awards in specific instances, have nowhere been systematically formulated. The Training Act is heavily oriented toward vocational and professional education in a rather concrete "job improvement" sense, and the overwhelming preponderance of expenditures, programs and personnel involved in operations under the Act are of this nature. Mid-career educational programs of the sorts undertaken by the universities represented in this Conference account for a very small part of total mid-career education and training operations. Moreover, the in-house Federal agency educational activities in what may loosely be designated as the policy and management area -- in the Foreign Service Institute, the Senior Seminar, and the War College, to name a few -- represent a vastly larger investment of money and time than the total allocated to the programs of the institutions participating in these discussions.

This is not to say that there is not a felt need in the Federal agencies for the kinds of educational experiences the universities are able to offer in the public policy and management areas. It is to say that those who feel the need are by no means multitudinous, and that even among those who do feel the need the sensation is something short of an obsession. In these circumstances it is not to be wondered that no very specific formulation of the ends and purposes sought to be achieved by mid-career education in public affairs has been elaborated by the consumers. Indeed, since we have never been able to decide what the purposes of the public school system are, it would be extraordinary if this miniscule undertaking in mid-career education were informed by clear goals and objectives. The fact seems to be that if the purposes are to be defined, the universities will have to define them. The predicament appears to correspond very closely to Wayne Leys' category of situations in which the criteria of ends are undetermined and the methods are undefined; it will be remembered he goes on to note that in these circumstances the administrator may regard himself as having been invited to engage in a bit of social engineering. This is an invitation not lightly to be cast aside by political scientists, economists, sociologists, and lesser breeds without the law.

A. Broadening of Horizons

If the characteristics of the mid-career student's previous formal education and work experience are substantially as we have described them, and if he is in fact on the threshold

of expanded administrative responsibilities, the most important single purpose his mid-career educational experience should seek to serve is that of broadening his horizons. This has both general and specific implications. In a general sense his horizons are broadened by introduction to new subject matter and new ideas -- mind-stretching, in the common parlance. This is mainly a function of the quality of the instruction he receives. In a specific sense his horizons are broadened by giving him a more acute understanding of the total governmental process, helping him to relate the operations in which he has been involved to the general purpose of the agency and to the overall objectives of the government in the area, and by enabling him to comprehend the relationships between these general objectives and the national purpose. If this language seems abstract, the underlying problem is not.

Most mid-career students have no more conception of the United States Government than they have of an infinite universe. The department in which they are employed is only a little less unreal, but this is only because of the frequency with which they observe its name on letterheads. In a large organization even the bureau is a distant apparatus with which they are conscious of only reportorial relations. The division begins to have identifiable dimensions, but what really exists is the office and the car-pool. It is not surprising that this should be so. There is very little in the work experience that attributes direct operational importance to the superior organizational strata. There is much in the work experience that encourages a parochial, even myopic, view of administration. Indeed, the sacred principle of functionalization carried to its logical limits practically guarantees a limited and essentially self-centered outlook. The most important single purpose of the mid-career educational experience is to persuade the students to join the United States by introducing them to the total governmental process, from which the significance of their own work and activity derives.

In the second place, the work in which the students have been, and will again be, involved needs to be related to the larger agency purpose. This transcends considerations of hierarchy, jurisdiction, and even the separation of powers and federalism, and brings us face-to-face with administration by objective. But if government agencies have done little to formulate their purposes and objectives in mid-career education, they are little better off with respect to the objectives of their own operations. If the Government Organization Manual and the encyclopedias of standard operating procedures are credible evidence, the "why" questions do not appear to be appropriate topics for discussion in polite society. Part of this is bureaucratic cynicism. More of it is timidity in dealing with language that has received the apostolic

benediction at the other end of the Avenue. Obviously "why" is a major premise in the justification of authorizations, but it tends to be a thoroughly inarticulate one. It is likely that the articulation will have to be provided by the universities, if it is provided at all.

After the unstated premises have been stated and after the inarticulate has been articulated, the multitudinous objectives of the myriad programs of numerous agencies -- to the extent that they are not incompatible and self-cancelling -- must be related to the national purpose. It cannot reasonably be supposed that all agency programs and sub-programs can be integrated teleologically with the Great Society, or the New Frontier or the New Deal, or even Back to Normalcy. A society capable of such an integration would no longer be pluralistic and whatever else may happen to our society we may be reasonably sure that it will not become a monolithic one. But somewhere short of the Great Society, which like other large and nebulous notions does little more than nibble at the edges of the political and social system, there are, or ought to be, some reasonably stable national goals which survive changes in men and in parties and even the vicissitudes of international relations. It is important that a civil servant have a vision of these goals and of how they are subserved by agency programs and subprograms, and even by the office and the car-pool. To give him this vision involves a tour de force of synthesis and imagination which challenges the full resources of the universities. A doctrine of mid-career education must accept -- or reject -- the challenge.

B. Understanding the Purpose and Nature of Staff Work

If there is one characteristic which more than another differentiates the mid-career man who is ready for substantial managerial and policy-formulating responsibilities from one who is not, it is his sensitivity to the uses and abuses of staff work. Paul Appleby pointed out several decades ago that we have "operators" more or less efficient, in great numbers in the civil service. Most of the mid-career awardees are, not unnaturally, from the operating categories. But he went on to point out that the successful operators were not very useful at the superior levels of government management unless they possessed also the quality of philosophy, of which the sinews are completed staff work. However, staff work encompasses certain of the convergences at which process sometimes gets on top of purpose, and the way it is employed frequently determines which mid-career man becomes a "bureaucrat" in the pejorative sense, grinding out the imperatives of his organizational and status-preserving instincts, and which becomes a civil servant capable of responding to the moral and intellectual demands of the policy process at the superior levels

of government management. The mid-career man in transit. so to speak between operations and management needs to understand the uses and limitations of staff work in respect of three important areas (1) management and operations planning· (2) operations control· (3) evaluation.

One way or another. practically everything the mid-career student or any other student in the programs carried on by the institutions involved in this Conference.does come into focus eventually. if it comes into focus at all, on the techniques of staff work in management and operations planning -- in short on the method and substance of policy decision-making. Indeed it is this command of the new methodology of research and substantive expertise in the policy process, with their quantification computerization and vastly increased rigorousness of formal analysis. which differentiate a fair number of the more recent entrants into the civil service from their predecessors versed in the antediluvian arts of budget estimating, personnel classification, organization and methods work. et cetera. Almost everywhere the deservedly popular seminars and courses of public affairs curricula are those which have been brought into existence by new technology -- operations research and systems analysis. to take abvious examples -- or those to which the increments supplied by new technology have enormously stiffened and broadened the hard science base of the subject matter -- of which cost-benefit analysis is as good an example as another.

While the universities did not invent the new technology-- although it did come. in the main. from university people in the employ of organizations such as RAND or otherwise involved in Government research and development contracts -- they have by adoption, assimilation and refinement become its acolytes. its high priests and eventually its Apostolic Delegates. For all practical purposes they own and operate the new congeries of administrative sciences. This fact impales them securely on the horns of a profound dilemma. It is true that the new behavioralism is by no means the sum total of the contribution which the universities have to offer to education in public affairs but it is certainly the most glamorous and so far the most money-attracting facet of the operation. As late as fifteen years ago the elite of the political science profession, for example. either centered itself in or kept a firm grip on, the public law aspects of the discipline. This was not so much because constitutional, international, administrative, and municipal corporations law represented the most important challenges of political science, but rather because public law had a hard core, conducive to analytical rigor, which permitted the political scientist to cherish his illusion of being part of an intellectually first-class undertaking.

In the same way, a date with the Computer Center is as prestigeous today as a week-end with theChief Justice would have been fifteen or twenty years ago. Unhappily, the answers provided by the new methodology, like those developed from jurisprudence and the higher legal ratiocination, are limited to problems involving the kind of date to which the methodologies are appropriate. In dealing with problems of public policy, this means that the techniques of the new administrative sciences are relevant primarily to the kinds of administrative operations which derive their values internally from the nature of the process rather than externally from the purpose of the organization. These sorts of operations, while certainly the most numerous and frequently the most time-consuming elements in the daily life of an administrator, are rarely those of important major administrative and political import.

But how is a university to save its dignity and at the same time to explain to mid-career and other students that the methods, techniques and subject matter before the altars of which the most brilliant members of the faculty burn their sacrifices, and to the mastery of whose rites the university attaches over-riding importance, are mainly relevant to the kinds of issues with which they have in the past been accustomed to deal on the basis of intuition and "common sense"? The situation has, of course, its own logic, and the new technology is not denigrated by noting its limited relevance to the non-quantifiable issues of public policy. But in the natural course of events it tends to assume and to retain heroic, not to say gargantuan, proportions. Time, we are well aware, will quickly remedy this sort of aberration; the question is what will be left, after the reawakening of a rational approach to operations and management planning.

On the other hand, the application of new methodologies and techniques to operations control and to evaluation raise few issues of relevance. For example, while we were apparently not able to plan rationally, and to avoid one of the most colossal logistical snafu's in the history of transportation, it is at least something to have very precise data with respect to the dimensions of the problem we have not solved in Viet Nam. Or is it?

C. <u>Accentuating Rigorousness of Judgment</u>

Because the mid-career students are preparing for managerial responsibilities, because the intellectual equipment which they bring to and take away from the mid-career educational experience is mainly relevant to the secondary and tertiary orders of their policy problems, and because the historical and philosophical subject matter of the mid-career

educational experience touches so tangentially the subjective and intuitive aspects of decision-making, the managers of the mid-career educational enterprise run a great risk of actually encouraging a less, rather than more rigorous approach to the analysis of important, but non-quantifiable, policy issues. In a very real sense the emphasis on objective and quantifiable methodologies tends to undermine whatever faith the mid-career man may have had in his common-sense judgments of yesteryear. It is worth pointing out that while the limitations of relevance are drastic, common sense has its own rigorousness and a substantial area of validity in dealing with relatively less complex issues of public policy. The question is, having denigrated his folk wisdom, are we able to put in its place anything worth having in the dimly-lit administrative jungle to which he is headed.

The essential problem in accentuating rigorousness of judgment is two pronged; it consists first in teaching the mid-career students how to break down their problems in terms which will identify the relevance and utility of the newer analytical techniques. Admitting the limitations of statistical and other types of analysis in the treatment of problems having important non-quantitative components does not excuse failure to apply quantitative analytical methods to all parts of the problem responsive to mathematical approaches and to the maximum degree to which these methods yield significant insights. Secondly, it consists in giving them a thorough working command of the principles and methods of logic and non-quantitative analysis generally, related specifically to the kinds of policy issues which they may expect to encounter when they return to their posts.

Moreover, the importance of exercising the maximum rigorousness of judgment in those important areas of policy where, because of the kinds of factors involved and the sorts of data therefore admissible in evidence, inductive methods and the apparatus of scientific analysis yield no significant conclusions, lends urgency to the establishment of a broad and rich understanding of American political, social and institutional history. When other referents prove unavailing, an administrator is sometimes able to derive great comfort from an intelligent reading of constitutional and institutional antecedents, as contrasted with merely following precedent and not reading at all.

D. Developing Administrative Entrepreneurship

An entrepreneur is one who takes the risks and picks up the profits or losses. From one point of view, the entrepreneur is interesting in the light of the rewards which risk-taking may produce. From another, he is interesting for the ways

in which he minimizes his personal risks. From still another, he is interesting for the way in which he minimizes the risks of the entire undertaking. It is this third aspect of entrepreneurship which is germane to our consideration of the development of entrepreneurial qualities in mid-career civil servants.

There is always risk in innovation and change. It is the risk-taking in the private sector that produces the rewards of the entrepreneur. But there is likewise risk-taking in the public sector, and not only because of the fact that government, as Herbert Emmerich has reminded us, is the last refuge of free enterprise. Every new program is a risk. The Peace Corps was one of the longest long-shots that has been played in the history of American politics. The Poverty Program is another. Appalachia is still another. The list could be a very extended one, indeed. And back of every name on it is an entrepreneur.

An administrative entrepreneur is not merely a risk-taker, any more than a private entrepreneur is merely a gambler. He is a man who sees possibilities, who visualizes inter-relationships, who has, in Appleby's words, "the quality of philosophy." Back of the Peace Corps was an insight -- a realization of the profound involvement of little people, all over America, with the human condition in the underdeveloped countries. There were many of us in a better position than Shriver to sense and understand this involvement, and quite a number of us in a better position to visulaize what the program might achieve abroad. Shriver saw it, bought it, and sold it to Kennedy. We didn't.

Not every one can be a Shriver. In addition to being the in-law of the right President at the right time, he had acquired other successful entrepreneurial experience under fairly rugged circumstances. But when one is citing an example, one may as well take the most glamorous. These are the kinds of men who are in short supply, both in the political jobs and in the civil service. Query: what should a mid-career educational program attempt to do about sensitizing its members to and stimulating their interest in the entrepreneurial function of the government service?

IV. CRITERIA RELATED TO THE CAPACITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

We come finally to the consideration of criteria which should inform our judgment about the capacity of the instrument selected to manage the mid-career education experience in administration and public policy. It should perhaps be pointed out at the beginning that the selection, even the self-selection, of universities to participate in mid-career education was in no sense a foregone conclusion. Indeed, only France and the United States, among major modern countries, attempt to manage substantial parts of the mid-career education experience through the machinery of academic education. It is true that Oxbridge provided facilities for many years for a period of ultimate embellishment of the education programs of the several colonial civil service organizations, but this was at the end of the pre-service cycle. Henley-on-Thames never had university connections, even in its civil service mid-career heydey. It is worth noting that the Ecole Nationale in Paris handles much of its mid-career educational acitivty through supervised internships, with a minimum of formalities in the rue des Saints Peres. And the government agencies in the United States which have on their own motion recognized the validity of post-entry education, such as the Army, the Air Force, and the Foreign Service, have initially moved to provide such education facilities "in house." It is only at a relatively recent date they have come knocking at the doors of the universities, and then only for a miniscule part of their post-entry educational requirements. To be sure, many university "continuing education" divisions and professional schools sponsor large numbers of weekend "continuation" seminars and other varieties of extension education for all sorts of professional personnel, even including government personnel. But this is rather different from taking a man completely out of his job and sending him off to a university for a year. In any case, most of the "continuing" education of this variety is for self-employed persons, such as doctors, lawyers, real estate agents, etc., and does not interfere with the pursuit of the dollar from 9 to 5.

A doctrine of mid-career education in management and public affairs can hardly avoid confronting the implications which ride on this choice of the universities for a central role in the process. Admitting the government's dependence upon university "types" for the formulation, planning and probably the actual operation of systematic mid-career education programs "in depth" as the phrase goes, it does not necessarily follow that the universities provide the beat of all possible environments in which such education may take place, nor that it should necessarily be assimilated to the types of educational operations which are the primary and most important university preoccupations.

A. Mid-Career Education and the Liberal Arts Tradition

There are many inner contredictions in the mid-career educational programs of the Institutions participating in this Conference. Some of them derive from the history and nature of American higher education. Some of them derive from the traditions of graduate education in certain universities. Some of them derive from the special conditions that exist where a single educational program in management and public affairs undertakes to serve two clienteles -- mid-career and pre-career students, or where the mid-career graduate students are assimilated into programs formed for the most part in response to the needs of graduate students preparing for careers as teachers and scholars in institutions of higher education.

It has been suggested earlier in this paper that at the general level of discourse there can be little argument about the professional status of the employees sent to the universities to undergo the mid-career education experience. They are professionals. But are we professionals? And is what we are trying to give them professional education? Many of the universities joined in this Conference represent themselves as offering professional education. I take it the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard is a professional school. The Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton certainly so regards itself. The Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell must surely be a professional school. At Virginia, at Indiana, at Chicago, at Stanford, and at Washington the professional imprimatur is somewhat less blatant, but from what I know at first hand about Virginia and at second hand as dearest friend and sometimes severest critic of the others, the acceptance of the obligation to train the mid-career students in their profession is just as unequivocal as it is at Harvard, Princeton and Cornell.

Whether the mid-career educational experience is offered under the auspices of a university agency formally dedicated to professional education is, of course, trivial. We are not concerned with issues of formal academic organization, but of our conceptions of the nature of the education we are providing. We are attempting to offer professional civil servants professional education in management and public affairs. Now the essence of professional education, which differentiates it from other types of graduate education is the marriage of theory and action implicit in its purpose. Professional education is education for doing. Liberal arts education at the graduate level is becoming increasingly education for theorizing with no implications of responsibility for action.

The mid-career education programs lean heavily upon liberal arts graduate education for both subject matter and personnel. This is not necessarily bad, but it has important doctrinal implications which should not be lost sight of. There are three

major categories of instructors responsible for planning, organizing and conducting the mid-career programs. First, a senior group, most of whom have had extensive experience of one kind or another in the government over the past thirty years, is still active and influential; another ten years will see a substantial number of them retired. Second, there is a group senior and intermediate in age who have had little or no government experience, but whose subject-matter interests have attracted them to programs in management and public affairs. Third, the inheritors- a group of younger men with very limited experience in the public service or no experience at all -- will soon bear the responsibility for the entire enterprise. The number of people who are basically professional administrators who have become involved in teaching in programs of mid-career education in management and public affairs is so few it hardly registers in a mass enumeration. Most of them, in fact, are sitting in this room. It is worth noting, moreover, that much of the administrative experience of bona fide academics who have wandered in the corridors of power has been at the political level, and for the greater part is not of a kind that establishes any special rapprochement with the career people sent to the universities. The liberal arts orientation of the faculty is moderated by this sort of experience, but not very much.

As goes the faculty, so goes the subject matter. While many of the universities have developed special "core" or other seminars for the mid-career students -- indeed, since the mid-career group at Harvard constitutes all except a token representation of recent college graduates in the .Graduate School of Public Administration, all of the notable seminars which have flourished from time to time at the Graduate School have been in fact special operations mounted for mid-careerists -- a substantial part of the program is made up of offerings available in the departments or offerings taught by professors rooted in the departments with such accommodations as seem appropriate to the requirements of the mid-career group.

It should be emphasized that our concern in this matter is not related to the various questions of curriculum which have been discussed at length in previous conferences on mid-career education, and it would be a great mistake if this Conference permitted itself to become involved in curriculum issues. What we are interested in at this point is the implications for a doctrine of mid-career education of situations in which the teaching takes place in a context in which the traditions and objectives of liberal arts graduate instruction weigh heavily in the outlook of the instructors and in the organization of the materials. The specific doctrinal issue may be stated in these words: to what extent is the theory-action marriage of education for mangement and public affairs compatible with an environment in which liberal arts traditions and aims weigh so heavily they are likely on any specific issue to be dominant?

B. Mid-Career Education and the Teacher-Scholar Orientation

A closely related, but distinguishable problem in considering the criteria which should inform a doctrine of mid-career edcation is the relation of professional education with its teacher-scholar orientation to the theory-action combination which is the distinguishing characteristic of professional education. The basic problem in this context derives from the difference in values attributed to the study and learning processes. In the teacher-scholar tradition, the career of the graduate student is typically in the direction of greater and greater specialization, sharper and sharper discrimination, and narrower and narrower definition of evidence admitted to consideration. It is trite, but essentially true, to say that the graduate student in the teacher-scholar tradition is busily engaged in learning more and more about less and less. Whether he eventually winds up knowing everything about nothing is beside the point. What is constantly dinned into him is "knowledge in depth," without much regard to either the significance or the utility of the ore uncovered at the point of maximum penetration.

The mid-career student, and the professional student of management and public affairs generally, approaches the problem of study and learning with a quite different set of values. He is interested not in wresting the ultimate minimuscular fact from any defined body of subject matter, but of achieving sufficient familiarity with the subject matter to understand its utility, its limitations, and its methodology in connection with problems of public policy and management that arise in the transaction of the government's business. Far from needing the kind of minute and detailed knowledge of the field that a graduate student preparing for a scholarly career in a university deems essential -- and his professor requires -- the professional administrator's operations would be greatly handicapped by the burden of the irrelevant impedimenta.

The intellectual problem of the administrator is dominantly that of synthesis -- of bringing together and appraising divergent data, divergent appraisals and evaluations, and divergent views regarding the significance and the interrelationships of events. Analysis is an essential part of the process of getting ready for synthesis, but it is prologue. The insights required for effective participation in the formulation of policy or in managerial decisions derive almost altogether from the integrating abilities of administrative leaders.

The role of auniversity faculty long dedicated to pushing back the frontiers of knowledge by the constant and unremitting refinement of analytical methods, and the relentless pursuit of more precise intellectual finalities, raises fundamental issues

of educational doctrine when confronted with needs which look in quite different directions.

C. Mid-Career Education and Pre-Career Education

A third doctrinal issue related to the capacity of the instrument derives from the juxtaposition of mid-career students on the one hand and pre-career or other-career students on the other. In the part of this paper dealing with the relativity of the standards applicable to mid-career students, one aspect of this problem was mentioned; the mid-career students are not as "slick" an academic product, in terms of vocabulary, analytical ability, or general intellectual sophistication as the students recently graduated from college, whether preparing for careers in the public service or as teacher-scholars. This sometimes makes not only for conversational awkwardness, but for even more fundamental failures of communication. It raises the doctrinal issue whether the two functions are in fact compatible.

In a very real sense the confrontation of the mid-career and the pre-career or other-career students compels us to face the fundamental issue underlying the entire doctrinal problem. Is preparation for management and public affairs to be organized as integral, professional graduate education, with its own content and methodology defined in terms of the professional needs of persons engaged in or preparing for professional careers? Or is it possible to have the best of both worlds, by organizing an instructional apparatus that is professional with respect to part of its students, semi-professional with respect to another part, and dominantly non-professional with respect to a third part of the student body and almost all of the faculty?

ERIC Clearinghouse
FEB 14 1968
on Adult Education